IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 7.11.2007

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.D.DINAKARAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.REGUPATHI

H.C.P.No.1129 of 2007

Regina .. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamilnadu
   rep. by its Secretary
   Prohibition and Excise Department
   Fort St.George, Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2. The Commissioner of Police
   Chennai Police, Egmore
   Chennai-8. .. Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue Habeas Corpus as stated therein.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.S.Ilango
For Respondents : Mr.M.Babu Muthu Meeran
Addl. Public Prosecutor

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by P.D.DINAKARAN,J.)

The second respondent herein clamped an order of detention as against Narayanan alias Muttakadai Narayanan, son of Krishnan, husband of the petitioner, as the said authority arrived at the subjective satisfaction that the said detenu is a Bootlegger and he has to be detained under Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Officers, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Sand Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982).

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2.1. The order of detention dated 19.5.2007 came to be passed by the second respondent on the basis of the ground case said to have taken place on 27.4.2007 at about 6.00 a.m., when the Inspector of Police, Chennai City attached Prohibition Enforcement Wing, Madhavaram Unit along with his police party were conducting vehicular check at the junction of Redhills, Vadakarai, they found an auto bearing registration No.TN-05-J-9201 proceedings towards the said junction in high speed, on suspicion, the auto was stopped and they found Karnataka ID Arrack duplicate sachets of 50 ml. kept in gunny bags. In all 4500 numbers of sachets were seized and the detenu was arrested. A case was registered in Crime No.48 of 2007 on the file of Prohibition Enforcement Wing Madhavaram Unit for the offences punishable under Sections 4(1)(i), 4(1)(aaa) read with 4(1-A) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act. On chemical analysis, the Doctor stated that the arrack is mixed with 8.2 mg. of atrophine per 100 ml. arrack and the same is a poisonous substance.

2.2. Apart from the above, the detaining authority also took note of the two adverse cases pending against the detenu, viz., Crime No.75 of 2007 on the file of the Washermenpet Prohibition Enforcement Wing for the offence punishable under Section 4(1)(i) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act for the occurrence said to have taken place on 26.5.2007 and Crime No.47 of 2007 on the file of the Madhavaram Prohibition Enforcement Wing for the offence punishable under Section 4(1)(i) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act for the occurrence said to have taken place on 23.4.2007.

2.3. The detaining authority, having satisfied that the detenu is indulging in activities which are prejudicial to maintenance of public health and order, passed the impugned order.

3. Challenging the said detention, the wife of the detenu has come forward with the present Habeas Corpus Petition seeking a writ of habeas corpus to call for the records of the second respondent in Memo No.210/BDFGISSV/2007, dated 19.5.2007, to quash the same and thereby to direct the detenu, detained at Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai to be produced before this Court and to set him at liberty.

4. Heard Mr.V.S.Ilango, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.M.Babu Muthu Meeran, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the respondents.

5. The only contention advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that there is considerable delay in considering the representation and the same has rendered the detention illegal.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

6.1. Before delving into the issue relating to the delay as contended above, it would be apt to refer the law on the point.

6.2. Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India suggests that the obligation of the government is to offer the detenu an opportunity of making a representation against the order, before it is confirmed according to the procedure laid down under the relevant provisions of law, vide K.M. Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India, (1991) 1 SCC 476 .

6.3. The right to representation under Article 22(5) of the Constitution of India includes right to expeditious disposal by the State Government. Expedition is the rule and delay defeats mandate of Article 22 (5) of the Constitution of India, vide Ram Sukrya Mhatre v. R.D. Tyagi, 1992 Supp (3) SCC 65.

6.4. Any inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the Government in considering the representation renders the detention illegal, vide Tara Chand v. State of Rajasthan, (1980) 2 SCC 321 and Raghavendra Singh v. Supdt., Distt. Jail, (1986) 1 SCC 650.

6.5. It is a constitutional obligation of the Government to consider the representation forwarded by the detenu without any delay. Though no period is prescribed by Article 22 of the Constitution for the decision to be taken on the representation, the words "as soon as may be" in clause (5) of Article 22 convey the message that the representation should be considered and disposed of at the earliest. But that does not mean that the authority is pre-empted from explaining any delay which would have occasioned in the disposal of the representation. The court can certainly consider whether the delay was occasioned due to permissible reasons or unavoidable causes. If delay was caused on account of any indifference or lapse in considering the representation, such delay will adversely affect further detention of the prisoner. In other words, it is for the authority concerned to explain the delay, if any, in disposing of the representation. It is not enough to say that the delay was very short. Even longer delay can as well be explained. So the test is not the duration or range of delay, but how it is explained by the authority concerned. Even the reason that the Minister was on tour and hence there was a delay of five days in disposing of the representation was rejected by the Apex Court holding that when the liberty of a citizen guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India is involved, the absence of the Minister at head quarters is not sufficient to justify the delay, since the file could be reached the Minister with utmost promptitude in cases involving the vitally important fundamental right of a citizen, vide Rajammal v. State of T.N., (1999) 1 SCC 417.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

7. In the instant case, the impugned order of detention came to be passed on 19.5.2007. A representation was made to the Government and the same was received by it on 25.6.2007. Parawise remarks were called for from the detaining authority on 25.6.2007. After obtaining the remarks of the Sponsoring Authority, the detaining authority sent a report to the Government on 3.7.2007 and the same was received by the Government on 4.7.2007. The file was submitted for consideration of the Officers on 5.7.2007. The Under Secretary and the Additional Secretary considered the file on 6.7.2007. The Hon'ble Minister for P.W.D. and Law dealt with the file on 9.7.2007. But, the rejection letter was prepared only on 16.7.2007, viz., after seven days. Even though 14.7.2007 and 15.7.2007 happen to be public holidays, still a delay of 5 days exists. This delay was highlighted by the learned counsel for the petitioner. There is no convincing reply on behalf of the State for the said delay. We find some force as well as substance in this contention. We fail to understand as to why the matter was delayed for five days (excluding public holidays). There is absolutely no explanation for this delay.

8. At this juncture, a reference to the decision of the Apex Court in Kundanbhai Dulabhai Sheikh v District Magistrate, Ahmedabad, (1996) 3 SCC 194 is apposite:

> "In spite of law laid down above by this Court repeatedly over the past three decades, the Executive, namely, the State Government and its officers continue to behave in their old, lethargic fashion and like all other files rusting in the Secretariat for various reasons including red-tapism, the representation made by a person deprived of his liberty, continue to be dealt with in the same fashion. The Government and its officers will not give up their habit of maintaining a consistent attitude of lethargy. So also, this Court will not hesitate in quashing the order of detention to restore the 'liberty and freedom' to the person whose detention is allowed to become bad by the Government itself on account of his representation not being disposed of at the earliest."

WEB COPY

9. That apart, it is a settled law that there should not be supine indifference, slackness or callous attitude in considering the representation. Any unexplained delay in the disposal of representation would be a breach of the constitutional imperative and it would render the continued detention impermissible and illegal, vide K.M. Abdulla Kunhi v. Union of India, (1991) 1 SCC 476 .

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

The delay of five days which stands unexplained would fatalise the detention attracting Article 22 of the Constitution of India and therefore, the petition must succeed and the same is ordered as prayed for. The detention order dated 19.5.2007 is set aside. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith unless his custody is required in connection with any other case.

sasi

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

To:

1. The Secretary to Government
   State of Tamilnadu
   Prohibition and Excise Department
   Fort St.George, Chennai - 9.

2. The Commissioner of Police
   Chennai Police, Egmore
   Chennai-8.

3. The Superintendent,
   Central prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

4. The Joint Secretary to Government,
   Public (Law & Order)
   Fort Saint George, Chennai-9.

5. The Public Prosecutor
   High Court, Madras.

KA(CO)
dcp/20.11

H.C.P.No.1129 of 2007

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/